



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,101	12/19/2001	Carl Alexander Phillips	07703-362001/WCR0127	5058

26211 7590 10/18/2004
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
CITIGROUP CENTER 52ND FLOOR
153 EAST 53RD STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10022-4611

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,101

Applicant(s)

PHILLIPS ET AL.

Examiner

Salvatore Cangialosi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 16 May 2002.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-8, 12-15, 17-22, 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Saffari et al (5737418) in view of either Saltsov et al (6186339) or Walsh et al (6223876).

Regarding claim 1, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency (See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al (See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al (See Claim 13) show a

Art Unit: 3621

currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation. Regarding the exclusive or limitations of claim 2, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show an exclusive or combination with a key which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the key limitations of claim 3, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show an key process in the validator which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the random limitations of claim 4, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show a key table which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations because the strength of encryption is dependent on the degree of randomness of its keys. Regarding the exclusive or limitations of claims 5, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show an exclusive or key encryption which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the checksum limitations of claims 6, Saffari et al (Col. 6, lines 10-20) show a checksum which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the disable limitations of claims 7, Saffari et al (Col. 11, lines 1-10) show a checksum control which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the acknowledgement limitations of claim 8, Saffari et al (col. 8, lines 25-40, Col, 9, lines 35-50) show a checksum acknowledgement Saffari which is a functional

Art Unit: 3621

equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 12, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation.

Regarding claim 13, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal using keys which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et

Art Unit: 3621

al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation. Regarding the disable limitations of claim 14, Saffari et al (Col. 11, lines 1-10) show a checksum control which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 15, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal using keys which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation. Regarding claim 17, Saffari et

Art Unit: 3621

al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal using keys which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation because the strength of encryption is dependent on the degree of randomness of its keys. Regarding the transaction limitations of claim 18, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show a key table which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 19, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal using a key table which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It

Art Unit: 3621

is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). It is also noted that the use a key from a key table is the functional equivalent of future key storage because all keys contemplated to be used are stored in the table. Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation. Regarding the key limitations of claim 20, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show a key table which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations because the table includes all future keys. Regarding claim 21, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose means for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a

Art Unit: 3621

currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation. Regarding the exclusive or limitations of claim 22, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show an exclusive or combination with a key which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 24, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency (See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al (See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al (See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation. Regarding the exclusive or limitations of claim 25, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show an exclusive

Art Unit: 3621

or combination with a key which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the random limitations of claim 26, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show a key table which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations because the strength of encryption is dependent on the degree of randomness of its keys. Regarding the exclusive or limitations of claims 27, Saffari et al (Fig. 3) show an exclusive or key encryption which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the checksum limitations of claims 28, Saffari et al (Col. 6, lines 10-20) show a checksum which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the disable limitations of claims 29, Saffari et al (Col. 11, lines 1-10, col. 8, lines 25-40, Col. 9, lines 35-50) show a checksum acknowledgement Saffari which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

3. Claims 9-11, 16, 23, 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Saffari et al(5737418) in view of either Saltsov et al(6186339) or Walsh et al(6223876) and Zennah et al(5933816).

Regarding claim 9, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal using key signals which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the

Art Unit: 3621

use of specific authentication and public key encryption. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and because the substitution of public key would increase the security of the method. Regarding the key generation limitations of claim 10, Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the public key limitations of claim 11, Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 16, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal using key signals which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed

Art Unit: 3621

invention is the use of specific authentication and public key encryption. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and because the substitution of public key would increase the security of the method. Regarding the public key limitations of claim 23, Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 30, Saffari et al (See Figs. 2A and 4A, 7, 8, Col. 2, lines 20-45, Col. 5, lines 35-60, Col. 6, lines 10-55 claims 1-21) disclose method for validating currency by means of communicating an encrypted signal using key signals which enables the transaction acceptance substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific authentication and public key encryption. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication is a process which

Art Unit: 3621

enables the detection of counterfeit currency(See Col. 7, lines 60-65). Either Saltsov et al(See Col. 1, lines 20-25) or Walsh et al(See Claim 13) show a currency validators including authentication. Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Saffari et al because the currency validators are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and authentication is a necessary component of validation and because the substitution of public key would increase the security of the method. Regarding the key generation limitations of claim 31, Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the key generation limitations of claim 32, Zennah et al(Col. 16, lines 40-45) show public key encryption in a currency transaction process which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number (703) 305-1837. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Serial Number: 10/025,101

13

Art Unit: 3621

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park
V, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Seventh
Floor(Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of
this application or proceeding should be directed to the
Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) **308-4177**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be
obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR)
system. Status information for published applications may be
obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status
information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,
see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on
access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222